

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. CASTLE] assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee will resume its sitting.

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Committee resumed its sitting.

□ 1130

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] had 8 minutes and 50 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] had 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD two letters of support for the amendment, one from the American Council on Education, the other from the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators.

The letters referred to are as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION,  
Washington, DC, May 16, 1995.

Hon. BILL ORTON,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon House  
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ORTON: The American Council on Education, on behalf of our 1700 college and university members, urges all members to support the Stenholm-Orton substitute to H. Con. Res. 67—the FY 1996 Concurrent Budget Resolution. The Stenholm-Orton substitute achieves the goal of deficit elimination, while maintaining the critical federal student loan, grant and work programs that ensure access to college for students from middle- and lower-income families.

In stark contrast, H. Con. Res. 67 would increase the cost of college by more than \$24 billion over seven years, subjecting middle-class families to the largest tuition hike in the nation's history. This burden will be borne by students currently in college, as well as by children as young as thirteen years of age who will reach college age during the period of time governed by this resolution.

Earlier this month, the Census Bureau released the results of a detailed survey of American business commissioned by President Bush, documenting that increases in workers' education levels produce twice the gain in workplace efficiency as comparable increases in the value of tools and machinery. According to this study, for each additional year of schooling in their workforce, employers gain an 8 percent increase in productivity, rising to 11 percent in the nonmanufacturing sector.

The Stenholm-Orton substitute recognizes the strong linkage between higher education and future national productivity and economic growth. We urge you to vote to defeat the seriously flawed H. Con. Res. 67, and to adopt the Stenholm-Orton substitute.

Sincerely,

TERRY W. HARTLE,  
Vice President.

## NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS,

Washington, DC, May 17, 1995.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA) representing over 3,200 postsecondary institutions across the country, we urge passage of the Stenholm/Orton substitute amendment to the House Budget Resolution. We are supporting the Stenholm/Orton substitute because it restores \$35 billion in Function 500 for education programs from levels contained in the committee-reported resolution. It also retains the in-school interest subsidy for student loan borrowers.

Our members are well aware of the need to constrain federal spending and are fully supportive of responsible efforts to reduce the deficit. However, we respectfully urge you to consider that the federal student aid programs have been essentially frozen since FY-93 and are not contributing to the deficit. To the contrary, research shows increased educational attainment, made possible for millions because of these programs, has accounted for 27 percent of the growth in the national economy during this century. Some will argue that eliminating the interest exemption on student loans will not prevent students from obtaining the loans and will be an additional expense which borrowers can easily repay because they will have higher future earnings. But the fact remains that such a policy will result in significantly higher yearly payments for these individuals and will reduce their ability to purchase other goods and services and save for their children's education. Federal student aid expenditures are an investment in the nation's future, and the monies spent on these programs today are returned by the program recipients many times over in the future.

Public opinion polls show that there is overwhelming support by Americans from all income categories and of all political persuasions for federal spending on programs to help students go to college. These polls clearly show that 75% of Americans do not want to see federal student aid programs and benefits sacrificed in the name of deficit reduction or tax cuts. We therefore strongly urge you and your fellow House members to consider all of the consequences before voting to reduce federal student aid programs below existing levels, or imposing mandatory reductions in spending which would result in a loss of benefits to current and future recipients.

It is for these reasons that we urge you to vote for the Stenholm/Orton substitute.

Sincerely,

DALLAS MARTIN,  
President.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER], a member of the coalition.

(Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman KASICH for bringing a bill to the floor that we think we have an opportunity to make better. I would like to thank our minority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, for giving the coalition this opportunity to be on the floor.

All of us here in this House in the coalition that many of us belong to here came to Washington to try to get something done. People are tired of partisan political bickering. They are tired of the gamesmanship that is being played in this town while the country does not do very well.

Our group, the coalition, has tried to make a difference, a commonsense difference, and I would suggest that this is a defining moment for us in this budget document.

Let me say why I think that. Any business person in this country, man or woman, faced with a \$4½ trillion debt and wondering how to right the wrongs that have been done in the past would say if only this would say this. It makes no sense to add another \$160 billion on the debt as we go to ground zero. At 6 percent that is almost \$10 billion more in interest payments alone that will have to be made if we adopt the Kasich approach.

I can go home to Tennessee through West Virginia or Kentucky or I go home to Tennessee through Virginia and Tennessee. We both get to ground zero. There is a businesslike, commonsense way to take our deficit down in a way that makes sense, that spends less money, that ties revenues to expenditures, as any business person would do, and that is exactly what this commonsense, businesslike proposal does. I would recommend it to my colleagues. I hope they will consider it and I hope they will give it their independent thought and judgment. It deserves that.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] has 6 minutes and 50 seconds remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has the right to close.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Let me congratulate Messrs. ORTON, STENHOLM, BROWDER, and other Members who have presented this budget. I intend to vote for it. It represents a very substantial improvement over the Republican base bill, both as it relates to basic fiscal policy and as it relates to dealing with fundamental problems of the American people. I congratulate the gentleman on this amendment and wish him well. I hope his amendment prevails.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we have a tall order before us, \$1.2 trillion in spending reductions to get to 2002 in a balanced budget.